DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 939 IR 005 418

AUTHOR	Herlig, Richard K.
TITLE	The Tenth National Dissemination Conference. A Report.
INSTITUTION	Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 77
GRANT	400-76-0075
NOTE	21p.; For related documents, see IR 005 419, ED 143 334-335 and 308
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Principles; Conference Reports; Conferences; *Information Dissemination; *Information Networks; *National Programs; *State of the Art Reviews
IDENTIFIERS	*Educational Information Centers; National Dissemination Conference

ABSTRACT

This report on the Tenth National Dissemination Conference of 1977 outlines the purposes of the conference and summarizes the present state of educational information dissemination. National programs are described, including the National Institute of Education State Capacity Building Program, the National Diffusion Network, the Dissemination Analysis Group, The Research and Development Exchange, the Research and Development Utilization Program, and the National Dissemination Leadership Project. The report includes an overview of presentations on dissemination programs institutionalized within their state agencies. The full text of "Statement of Agreement by Professionals in the Field of Educational Dissemination at the June 1977 Dissemination Forum" is appended. (KP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED146939

THE TENTH

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

A REPORT

National Dissemination Leadership Project

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard Herlig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

IR005418

JUNE 1977

RICHARD K. HERLIG

The purposes of the 10th National Dissemination Conference are stated below:

To acquaint conferees with the programatic activities which comprise the national scene

To orient conferees to the National Dissemination Leadership Project and their role and responsibilities as state dissemination reps

To provide conferees with those skills which will facilitate the institutionalization of a co-ordinated SEA dissemination system

To provide an opportunity to meet for the purpose of sharing and conducting of regional business

To provide an opportunity for dissemination representatives to discuss and prioritize policy issues related to dissemination

To provide dissemination representatives with the opportunity to influence future directions of the National Dissemination Leadership Project

The work presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

CCSSO **(NIE 400-76-0075)**

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED—No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

THE TENTH

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

Introduction

The summer of 1977 marked the 10th National Dissemination Conference, held in Arlington, Virginia, in conjunction with the first Dissemination Forum. At the Forum were more than 400 professionals in various dissemination jobs--representing the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), research labs and centers, federal officials, participants in the National Diffusion Network (NDN), state dissemination representatives and others.

The meeting also marked an interesting crossroads in the field of educational dissemination. Looking back just a decade, one can quickly see how far dissemination has come. In that time, there has been the creation of ERIC--a nationwide computerized system for storing and retrieving education resources, the formation of the National Institute of Education with a Congressional mandate to disseminate its research, the development of the National Diffusion Network in the U.S. Office of Education to disseminate exemplary federal programs and the establishment of dissemination systems in many state departments of education. Perhaps transcending all of these is the acceptance at both the federal and state level that dissemination is a vital, if unfulfilled, mission in education. As Byron Hansford, executive director of the Council of Chief State School Officers, said in his opening remarks, "Dissemination is at the heart of what a state education agency should be doing."

Senta Raizen, NIE's associate director for dissemination and resources, noted that in three years with relatively stable budgets, NIE had tripled its expenditures for dissemination-- a strong indication of its growing importance. Further, the efforts and activities of NIE and CCSSO on dissemination represent

one of the best examples of "a cooperative working relationship between the federal government and the states," she said.

But along with the obvious progress is the unmistakable evidence that much needs to be done. Local administrators and teachers still don't have access to or don't make use of the impressive array of educational products and research information that has been developed in the last 20 years. Most state departments of education have begun programs to disseminate these products and this knowledge, but many are fledgling efforts that have not yet achieved high visibility or ready acceptance. So until the products of education research and innovative practices are put to their best use in improving education, educational disseminators have a lot of work ahead.

During the four-day forum, state representatives, coordinated by the National Dissemination Leadership Project, met separately during the first day and a half. They heard presentations on federal dissemination initiatives, discussed exemplary state programs and considered amendments to a paper on "Principles of Education Dissemination." This report is a summary of the proceedings of that meeting.

National Programs

One purpose of the conference was to acquaint dissemination representatives, especially those new to the field, with the various federal efforts in educational dissemination. Experienced state reps also got a chance to renew acquaintances with federal officials and hear the latest information on their programs. Each of the 30-minute presentations were repeated several times so the representatives could hear several.

NIE's State Capacity Building Program is the crux of the agency's effort to improve state dissemination programs. This initiative, begun in 1975, re-

cognized that state education agencies are in the key position to disseminate information and products to local school districts. More than half of the states have received capacity building grants so far.

The capacity building grant program has been well received because it gives a state considerable flexibility in the design and implementation of their programs. NIE has not tried to impose a dissemination strategy on states, but rather has recognized that each has unique needs and capabilities. Typically, states have used the grants to tie local educators into a state information bank, which is itself often tied into the ERIC system. The capacity building grants can be renewed from three to five years, thus giving states time to develop a program and create a visible demand for the service. The intention then is that such a program will become a regular part of the SEA's activities. NIE also offers "special purpose" grants as part of this program which are more limited in their scope, duration and funding. Often, a special purpose grant is the first step toward getting a capacity building grant. Each year, several more states get involved in the program, so that hopefully at some point, all the states will be building their dissemination capacity.

The National Diffusion Network (NDN), established by the U.S. Office of Education in 1974, is a coordinated system for helping school districts adopt exemplary programs. It is a complete diffusion system-- from validation of exemplary programs to actual adoption-- but it is strictly a product-oriented approach to dissemination. Usually the products are innovations previously funded by federal Title III or Title IVc grants.

The NDN system begins with innovative products or practices which are submitted to a federal review panel called the Joint Dissemination Review Panel. If approved by the panel, the originators of these successful projects can apply

for and receive a "developer/demonstator" grant from NDN. These grants, averaging about $70,000, allow the developer to provide materials, training and demonstrations for others interested in the project. A second type of grant, often received by state or regional education agencies, allows "facilitators" to help link the developers and the interested school districts. Typically, a facilitator could prepare and distribute brochures or catalogs of exemplary projects in the NDN system. Another strategy is to hold an "education fair" where educators can get a first hand look at various projects and can talk to the developers. NDN also gives out "adoption grants" to help defray the cost of adopting new programs. But to avoid the obvious financial incentive for districts to adopt NDN products, these grants have recently been incorporated into the state facilitator grants.

A recent evaluation of NDN by the Stanford Research Institute gave the program high marks and said more than 1,000 innovations had been adopted by school districts in just two years. As one reason for its success, the evaluators cited the many opportunities for person-to-person contact and the enthusiasm of the developers.

A high-level, year-long study of federal education dissemination activities was recently completed by the Dissemination Analysis Group (DAG). The DAG committee, which included several state dissemination representatives, presents a comprehensive view of the problems and progress of the national efforts in educational dissemination.

The report has attracted attention for several reasons. First, it set forth a four-part definition which was incorporated into the "Principles of Dissemination" paper. The definition of dissemination is as follows:

1. Spread. This is the "one-way casting out of knowledge in all its forms." Examples include radio or television broadcasts, general mailings,

news releases, magazine articles, newsletters, and ERIC inclusions.

2. Exchange. "The two-way flow of information, products or ideas." This includes "needs assessing, needs sensing or sharing activities such as feedback from peers."

3. Choice. Helping teachers and school officials to "select among those ideas, materials, research and development products, effective educational practices and other knowledge that can be used for the improvement of education." Examples include the training of decisionmakers, searches of resource bases, visits by decisionmakers to a variety of demonstration sites, traveling exhibits and catalogs comparing alternatives.

4. Implementation. "The facilitation of adoption, installation and the ongoing utilization of improvements." This includes "consultation, on-site technical assistance and local tailored training groups."

The DAG report also includes a detailed discussion of the problems that have hampered effective dissemination.

The Research and Development Exchange (RDx) is a new NIE effort to disseminate research knowledge through the network of regional labs and university R&D centers. The RDx is well-named since its main purpose is to create an "exchange" of information between the research centers and educational practitioners. Its final form and many of its activities are still emerging, since its planning phase doesn't end until November 30. Many of the R&D centers serve regions and are linked to local schools through the state educational agency. Practitioners will thus be able to send questions to the SEA which will be referred on to the R&D center. The RDx has a second purpose-- to develop several means for practitioners to influence the goals and activities of the R&D community. Presently, five labs and centers will work with 33

states in the RDx.

The Research and Development Utilization (RDU) program is another of NIE's recent dissemination initiatives. In fiscal 1977, RDU made seven awards-- four to SEAs and three to regional education agencies. The program has two prime purposes-- to better use and understand research knowledge as it applies to schools and to help solve specific problems in basic skills and career education. So the program seeks to not only apply dissemination to solving the vital problems but also to better understand the process of disseminating educational research.

Unlike most of the state capacity building grants, the RDU grants to states usually involve bringing together more actors. For example, the Florida Linking System, with its RDU grant, will combine the resources of the Florida SEA, the University of Florida, Florida State University, five teacher education centers and 16 school districts. RDU is administered by NIE's School Practices and Service Division.

National Dissemination Leadership Project

Richard Herlig, director of the National Dissemination Leadership Project (NDLP), briefed a luncheon gathering on NDLP and its history. NDLP is a project of the Council of Chief State School Officers and is funded by NIE. Its membership includes dissemination representatives from 56 states and territories. Its purposes are several-- to formulate state policies on dissemination, to coordinate state input into federal dissemination programs and to share progress and problems among state dissemination representatives. Within the past year, NDLP has held three topical conferences for dissemination representatives-- on management, resources and linkage. In his talk, Herlig emphasized the progress that has been made in dissemination within a few short years.

The accompanying table lists some of the highlights:

TABLE 1. MAJOR MILESTONES IN DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CAPABILITY

1965	The U.S. Office of Education (USOE) implemented the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC), soon renamed the Educational Resource Information Center, to acquire, process, and store easily retrievable educational information for practitioners.
1969	USOE called the first National Dissemination Conference in Alexandria, Virginia, which brought together representatives from state education agencies to examine dissemination efforts within SEA's and to explore ways to improve capabilities.
1970	USOE established the National Center for Education Communication (NCEC) to become the focus for expanded efforts in information dissemination.
	NCEC funded the Texas Education Agency for the purpose of operating a project to strengthen state dissemination programs, by holding national conferences and providing other opportunities for opening lines of communication between and among SEA's and USOE.
	NCEC also funded three pilot projects — Oregon, South Carolina, and Utah — for testing the feasibility of the extension agent model on dissemination.
	The second National Dissemination Conference was held in Austin, Texas.
1971	The third National Dissemination Conference was held in Columbia, South Carolina.
	South Carolina became the funding agent for the second phase of the National Dissemination Project. The conferences were continued and information efforts were increased with establishment of a dissemination newsletter.
	A small number of additional states were funded to establish information services, some with limited extension agent capabilities.
	The fourth National Dissemination Conference was held in St. Louis, Missouri.
1972	Congress established the National Institute of Education with dissemination among its special charges; NCEC activities and staff were transferred to NIE.
	The fifth National Dissemination Conference was held in Columbia, South Carolina.
1973	The Council of Chief State School Officers became the funding agent for the National Dissemination Project.
	The sixth National Dissemination Conference was held in Chevy Chase, Maryland.
1974	The seventh National Dissemination Conference was held in Washington, D. C. It had a dual emphasis: 1) opening lines of communication between and among state education agencies and NIE, and 2) continuing the strengthening of state competencies in dissemination.
1975	The eighth National Dissemination Conference was held in Washington, D. C.
	NIE began a program to strengthen state dissemination capabilities through a series of capacity building and special project grants.

Glenn White from Missouri, chairman of the NDLP steering committee, then explained the workings of the steering committee as it relates to both NDLP and state reps. As designed by NIE and CCSSO, the leadership project offers "a forum for an exchange of views", an opportunity to "identify critical issues", and a means of giving state input to federal dissemination programs, White said. But the steering committee is "really the mechanism" that makes it all work, he added. The present NDLP steering committee members are: Edward Danbruch (Rhode Island), Karen McCarthy (Vermont), Elmer Knight (South Carolina), John Osborne (Michigan), Mary Jo Bruett (Iowa), Diane Wilson (Colorado), Ken Lindsay (Utah), Charles Brown (Idaho), Charles Haughey (NIE), and Fred Brown (CCSSO).

State dissemination representatives should be "catalysts" for dissemination within their SEA, Elmer Knight, South Carolina's representative and an NDLP steering committee member, told the gathering. "You represent dissemination within your SEA and you must work where you can to promote the cause." But he cautioned against overstepping the bounds. "You must still work within the overall philosophy of your SEA, and each one is different."

Institutionalization

The conference also included a series of presentations on dissemination programs that have been institutionalized within their state agency. Institutionalization can be a subtle, if vital, step for a dissemination effort. One speaker came up with a simple way of detecting the change. "I realized we were institutionalized this year when we dropped 'project' from our title and became a 'division'." These small group presentations were also repeated so conferees could hear more than one.

One fine example of a firmly entrenched dissemination effort is the Texas Information Program. A staff of seven in the SEA Division of Dissemination

handles questions and requests through searches of ERIC as well as state and local files. The service is funded almost entirely through state and regional funds, not federal dollars, because educators throughout the state "have recognized the usefulness of the services," said Patrick Martin in describing the program. The information system is now expanding its files in special education and vocational education and keeps an accurate account of who uses what. This is one way to justify the need for extra funding, Martin said.

How did the system become so well-established? "Clout," he replied. Texas had one commissioner of education for many years who was an innovator and believed in dissemination, he said. As a result, the state board adopted a policy that no other division in the SEA could undertake a dissemination activity without first consulting the dissemination division. In addition, quick, reliable and effective service over the years has created a series of supportive clients throughout the state. "We have districts that have a hard and fast rule that nothing new is begun until they've first searched the literature," he said.

The Kansas Educational Dissemination/Diffusion System (KEDDS) is a few steps short of the Texas program, said Nancy Flott. Just this year, the project was incorporated into the SEA's Improvement and Development Division. Its two staff positions are funded mostly by federal Title IV funds, she said. "The commitment from the commissioner was the turning point," she added. He set a policy requiring all divisions considering dissemination activities to "first check with us," she said. But he has not yet committed much state funding to the system.

In a later session, Jim Connett described the two components of KEDDS--a resource base located in the SEA in Topeka and a linkage component in Wichita.

The resource component has several data bases, including a file of "promising practices" and a list of approved consultants. It is also linked to the state library system. The linkage component has what it calls "facilitators" who work directly with local school districts. KEDDS, like other institutionalized systems, is seeking funding from other sources and has served 170 of the more than 300 Kansas school districts.

Ken Mellor of Rhode Island and Greg Benson of New York, stressed the importance of understanding the process and timing of state budgets. "To be included in our state budget," Mellor said, "a request for funding must be received 18 months ahead of time. So if your NIE capacity building grant were to run out in June, 1978, it would be already too late to request state funds to replace it." A budget request in Rhode Island must also pass four reviews--(1) the education commissioner, (2) the state board of regents, (3) the Governor's staff, (4) the state legislature. "The first time you go to bat, you probably won't pass all the reviews," he said.

Mellor also emphasized the need to "bring your constituencies to the point where they expect to see the funds." If they've received service in the past and they're convinced the service is worthwhile, they'll support the budget request, he said. Thirdly, Mellor advised the state reps to "look for a mix funds. You can't rely just on state or federal money." While you have an NIE capacity building grant, it's a good idea to provide service to the categorical programs, he suggested. For example, if you run a conference for the Title IVc staff, they'll be more likely to later want to put funding into dissemination. Benson pointed out that in such a case, dissemination people should "keep a low profile" so as to not threaten or lose the trust of the Title IV staff. "But they'll remember where the help came from," he said.

Talking of federal categorical programs, Mellor noted that the time is right for working with the special education staffs. Because of the federal Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142), the special ed unit has "a great demand for service placed on it" plus some new money. Dissemination is included in the federal regulations as one requirement. "They have no special expertise in dissemination and need your help," he concluded.

Benson commented on the importance of internal communication. Since much of the struggle to institutionalize a program is gaining the confidence of the other parts of the SEA, he said, "You've got to keep other people informed who will be impacted by your program." Otherwise they are likely to be threatened and uncooperative. Benson's final point was that you have to keep selling the resource base. And one way to do that is to publicize data on successful grant applications. Last year, 80 percent of Title IV applications that used the resource files were funded, he said.

Phil Hawkins of Michigan talked about how to create linkage within the SEA and across the state. Hawkins said the education structure in Michigan has four layers-- SEA, regional units (22), intermediate districts (58), and local districts (558). "So person-to-person linkage is just the tip of the iceberg," he said. "Institutionalizing the dissemination program is really developing a way of relating across those four layers."

Even though its capacity building grant has not yet begun, Michigan's program has been building support in three areas, he said. First is "internal bridge building" within the SEA. Second is developing contacts with the professional organizations, which carry great weight in Michigan, Hawkins said. "They attend all the state board meetings and they have a say in everything." But through their communication channels and through their lobby-

ing, they can be powerful allies, he added. The third audience is Michigan's program based on the state library system, which is, of course, well-institutionalized. But it has not reached out to serve all levels of education. "There is a demand for our services; it's just a question of whether we'll be able to satisfy it," he concluded.

Principles Document

The NDLP group met Tuesday morning to consider a paper called "Declaration of Principles Among Professionals in Dissemination," drawn up by Larry Hutchins of NIE and Greg Benson of New York. In a letter accompanying the draft paper that was sent to all conference participants, Hutchins and Benson cautioned that the final paper "will not represent an official position, but rather a guide...and a basic foundation upon which we seek to design and implement a coordinated, efficient dissemination/diffusion network."

But as NDLP members discussed the paper in small groups, one of the first concerns expressed was-- why? One state rep commented that there seemed to be nothing in it that was not already expressed in the report on the Interstate Project of Dissemination (IPOD). But, though most of the principles had been long understood by state reps, those new to dissemination might find them useful. The paper could also be distributed to a wider audience. So the group decided to suggest amendments to the paper. For example, the group expressed its concern about the use of the term "system" throughout the paper. The feeling was that "system" connotes centralized control. This could easily be translated into federal control. To avoid that misconception, the term was changed to "nationwide dissemination configuration."

Overall, the NDLP group insisted that the document "recognize the constitutional responsibility of the states regarding education." In addition, some

editorial changes were insisted upon. For example, in the discussion of resource bases, the NDLP group urged that they be "ERIC-compatible." Also, in Proposition 7 describing roles, NDLP added the phrase "the autonomy of the states must be carefully preserved, consistent with their constitutional and legal responsibilities."

The final paper was passed by a vote of 191 yes, 4 no, and 4 not voting. The full text of the paper is appended.

STATEMENT OF AGREEMENT BY PROFESSIONALS
IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATIONAL DISSEMINATION
AT THE JUNE 1977 DISSEMINATION FORUM

Continuous efforts are required to maintain and improve educational practice so that all Americans have the opportunity to learn in accordance with their need. Research, development, evaluation and dissemination of effective practice are vital to the achievement of this goal.

At the current time a number of agencies, organizations, programs and systems are working in the area of dissemination. These existing efforts are making significant headway in providing support for educational improvement and should be encouraged to continue.

At the same time it is believed that the results of these efforts will be significantly improved if they can be incorporated into a "Nationwide Dissemination Configuration."* The development of such a configuration can help to alleviate the problems identified by recent analyses and assist the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education and other elements in the Education Division of HEW in meeting Congressional mandates related to dissemination.

The deliberate development of such a nationwide configuration, over time, can also help educators better understand the array of resources available to help them improve the educational system. The undertaking of such a nationwide effort is important; no single agency or group of agencies could or should develop a nationalized system or acquire and manage all the necessary resources.

To promote the development of such a Nationwide Dissemination Configuration, a group of professionals** in the area of dissemination met in Arlington, Virginia for one week in June 1977. They adopted the following statement of agreements as a means of providing a common base for all those who would undertake the development of the Nationwide Dissemination Configuration. (The recorded vote was 191 yes, 4 no, 4 not voting).

---

* The word "configuration" was chosen to coincide with Guba and Clark's use of the term in their paper cited below. The word "system" was rejected as connoting central control and "network" was rejected because of possible confusion with the National Diffusion Network. Guba, Egon G. and David L. Clark, The Configuration Perspective: A View of Educational Knowledge Production and Utilization, Council for Educational Development and Research, Washington, D.C., November, 1974.

** Participant groups included representatives from: ERIC Clearinghouse Personnel and Users; Evaluation contractors for major dissemination programs in O.E. and N.I.E.; National Diffusion Network Facilitators & Developer/Demonstrators; National Institute of Education--Office of the Director & Dissemination & Resources Group; Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education; Office of Education--All major Bureaus and the Reg. Offices; Research & Development Exchange contractors--selected Laboratories & Centers; Research & Development Utilization contractors; State Dissemination Representatives--National Dissemination Leadership Project.

No official endorsement from any of these groups should be inferred.

Agreement 1: The purposes and outcomes of dissemination activities are many--ranging from acquiring knowledge for its own sake to specific improvements in educational practice. Although the adoption of innovations and changes in practice are possible outcomes, dissemination activities can also lead to decisions to maintain existing practices rather than to change.

Agreement 2: A number of efforts have been made to define the word dissemination. These efforts make it clear that several meanings are possible when the word is used. The Dissemination Analysis Group (DAG), a joint government task force, has delineated four possible usages:

Usage 1: Spread: The one-way casting out of knowledge in all its forms: information, products, ideas and materials, "as though sowing seeds."

Usage 2: Exchange: The two-way or multi-way flow of information, products, ideas and materials as to needs, problems, and potential solutions.

Usage 3: Choice: The facilitation of rational consideration and selection among those ideas, materials, outcomes of research and development, effective educational practices and other knowledge that can be used for the improvement of education.

Usage 4: Implementation: The facilitation of adoption, adaptation, and installation of improvements.

It is recommended that future usage make clear which, if not all, are denoted.

Agreement 3: The development of a NATIONWIDE DISSEMINATION CONFIGURATION can enhance improvements in educational practice. Such a configuration should be open, non-prescriptive, and multi-purpose. It should be influenced by all levels of government and by other groups and individuals and not dominated by any one.

Agreement 4: An effective NATIONWIDE DISSEMINATION CONFIGURATION will require a broad, integrated resource base of knowledge. Information about educational research and development, practices, policy and legal matters should all be available through an ERIC-compatible index and a universally available set of access systems. These resources should be based on the current ERIC system, enlarged to encompass the resources of other educational information systems and clearinghouses as well as the addition of new types of data files as appropriate. Quality control of resources should be maintained. Adequate information should be provided so that the users may judge and evaluate these resources of their own purposes.

Agreement 5: Resources should be accessible to and supported by a variety of means and styles of linkage:

(a) Continuous efforts to organize and transform the knowledge base into langauge, format and styles suitable to a variety of different audiences should be maintained. Particular

attention should be paid to the needs of educators, lay-persons, policy-makers and especially those groups that traditionally have not had access to the knowledge base;

(b) human assistance in searching, interpreting and supporting the use of the knowledge base should be given by providing services that are accessible to users, provide rapid assistance and are as objective as possible;

(c) human, technical and financial assistance in implementing knowledge that promises to improve educational efforts should be available, particularly to decision-making groups within educational institutions. This assistance should include:

- technical assistance in implementing specific innovations, practices or products that meet the requirements of users;
- assistance to educational institutions to insure that they gain the capacity to use knowledge effectively;
- assistance to lay-persons and citizens groups that will provide them with the increased capability to influence educational practice;
- encouragement to those who risk changes in the status quo to undertake activities they believe will improve education.

The styles by which such linkage services are available should be broad and non-prescriptive.

Agreement 6: Dissemination, including the NATIONWIDE DISSEMINATION CONFIGURATION, should be an object of study and improvement in its own right.

(a) information about the configuration should be developed and communicated to insure an informed, public process for coordinating the configuration. Particular emphasis should be placed on the development of information about user needs and requirements--both in terms of new knowledge that should be created through research and development and in terms of services needed from the configuration;

(b) specific tools, training programs and other support efforts should be developed to insure the effective strengthening and growth of the configuration;

(c) research and development on alternative models, theories and practices of dissemiantion should be carried out and shared in a systematic way.

Agreement 7: Since the components of the configuration are now, and perhaps always will be developing, there maybe no absolute roles for various agencies, groups and individuals. In general, however, the configuration should be initiated with these assumptions about functions that should be performed at various levels.

(a) a national level function should be to:

- develop a community of interest that will establish goals for the configuration;
- operate those elements that serve nationwide needs;
- provide incentives for a variety of institutions to build their own capacity to operate the configuration within their spheres of activity;
- and support research and development on the configuration.

(b) a state level function should be to provide leadership in defining statewide dissemination systems unique to the requirements of each state. The autonomy of States must be carefully preserved, consistent with their constitutional and legal responsibilities;

(c) agencies engaged in direct instruction and those they serve should be the primary beneficiaries of the Configuration. The function of the Configuration should be to serve their needs with a minimum of constraint upon them. The Configuration should not promote change needlessly; instead, it should support efforts to maintain an environment in which students of all ages can learn. The Configuration should recognize the contribution that educators make as a source of exemplary practices and information about the effectiveness of other innovations. The autonomy of these agencies and their boards should be respected.

(d) educational laboratories, research centers, universities and colleges, professional associations, independent institutions, individual scholars and professionals should be encouraged to share and provide their knowledge and services through the Configuration and to participate in its study and management. They should be encouraged to build their capability to extend the Configuration as well as to provide technical assistance to it.

(e) it is recognized that the activities of public and tax-supported agencies are complementary with the activities of the private sector. Functions not adequately provided by the private sector can be undertaken by public and tax-supported agencies in

a way that encourages the private sector to be involved in the fullest extent possible.

Agreement 8: Support for such a Configuration must be cooperatively shared by all participants and beneficiaries. The development of this Configuration will require the expenditure of both fiscal and human energy. These resources are obtainable only through efforts that focus on cooperative and accommodating relationships among participants for the mutual benefit of all.

Agreement 9: The long term vitality of the National Dissemination Configuration is dependent not only on more effective utilization of existing knowledge and resources but on the continued support for appropriate research and development (R&D) so as to renew the knowledge base.